

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 921

EA 017 407

AUTHOR Wynne, Edward A.; McPherson, R. Bruce
TITLE Good Principals in Public and Church-Related Schools:
A Study in Socialization.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association (Montreal,
Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Reports -
Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Discipline; Educational Environment;
Elementary Secondary Education; Ethical Instruction;
*Leadership Qualities; *Principals; Research
Methodology; *School Effectiveness; School Role;
*Socialization; Traditionalism

ABSTRACT

Using a research approach founded on explicit normative assumptions about the social goals of education, and proceeding from the hypothesis that lifelong socialization largely determines an administrator's capability, this paper analyzes the experiences of one "good" principal. Following an initial discussion of educators' attitudes toward fostering social and moral values, the study's theoretical framework is outlined: a central theorem that defines schools as places where adults work together to socialize children for adulthood, and seven corollaries--qualitative criteria of "school goodness." Succeeding passages present an argument defending social continuity and examine conditions and opinions opposing and favoring deliberate socialization in schools. Next, the study's objectives, data sources, and data collection and analysis methods are reviewed. The balance of the paper consists of a case study of a Chicago public school principal. An autobiographical sketch recounts the subject's experiences in elementary school through college, in the army, in graduate school, as a teacher, and as a principal. A statistical and anecdotal description of the high school this principal directs follows. The paper concludes by discussing related literature, the significance of the subject's experiences, and the study's implications for future research and practice. References are included. (MCG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED253921

GOOD PRINCIPALS IN PUBLIC AND CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS:
A STUDY IN SOCIALIZATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Edward A. Wynne

and

R. Bruce McPherson

College of Education

University of Illinois at Chicago

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward A.
Wynne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the
American Education Research Association
Montreal, Canada

College of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago
Box 4348
Chicago, ILL 60680

Printed in the
United States
of America

EA 017 407

This paper is essentially about how good principals learn--or are socialized--into their roles. But, before we turn to that issue, it is necessary to derive some definition of a "good" school. After all, good principals presumably must preside over good schools, and so we must have some criteria for a good school. And so our paper must first treat with a fundamental issue: what should a good school aim to accomplish? Only after treating that matter can we define school goodness, or tell which principals are good, or study how they were socialized.

Resistance to Wholesome Socialization

It may seem self-evident that schools should hold as their first priority the socialization of children to be effective contributors to and participants in adult life. But in reality, while many educators give lip to such socialization, they confound its attainment in innumerable fashions.

Educators often obstruct wholesome socialization in the day-to-day operations: They fail to apply traditional in-school socialization techniques. Often, they do not maintain strong and clear discipline codes, encourage patriotic ceremonies and activities, give school spirit a high administrative priority, stimulate students to practice good citizenship in school, or apply rigorous grading and homework policies. In addition, there is frequent reluctance among educators to accept the necessary authority role of the school, the awkward role of hierarchy between faculty and students, or within the faculty itself. We understand that schools vary widely in committing these "errors"--and in fact, some schools hold to traditional modes. But when a 1979 Gallup Poll of teenagers shows that 53% of them thought they had not received enough homework in school, one begins to suspect

that some allegedly responsible adults have been slacking off (Gallup, 1979). We see a close relationship between good citizenship and the school practices just discussed.

In-school operations are not the only sign of resistance to such socialization. Our conduct is partly shaped by our ideas. Educators are of a highly mixed mind when it comes to fostering traditional values such as loyalty, honesty, and patriotism in schools. The most interesting statistics come from a survey by Firestone and Herriott of 12 varied northeastern public schools (1981). They received responses from 638 teachers, for an overall response rate of 76%. The respondents were asked a normative question: to choose, from a selection of 12 items, what should be the three top and bottom product goals of their schools. The responses were tabulated on a scale which covered the most preferred and most rejected items. The outcome of the tabulation were measures of consensus and dissensus. Consensus occurred when high proportions of teachers either approved of, or rejected, a particular item. Dissensus occurred when many teachers approved of an item, and many others rejected it. The highest consensus was on the importance of basic skills. The next highest was on the low importance of teaching science in elementary schools. The highest dissensus was on "respect for authority (discipline, character building)". It was the second most popular item among the respondents, and also one of the most unpopular ones. Thus, it was a highly controversial school goal among this group of teachers.

This research confirms our own experience in teaching educators, in conducting research in schools, and in administering schools. And it is consonant with our first remarks about the frequent rejection of traditional

socialization techniques in many schools. These techniques are partly rejected not so much because they do not "work", but because many educators disapprove of their basic purposes. Everybody appears to believe in schooling for citizenship. But the moment discussion turns to more specific prescriptions--e.g., "respect for authority"--the commonplace becomes a heated problem. When efforts are made to address specifics, educators begin to voice qualifications and hedge. Do you mean "legitimate" authority? And who decides what is "legitimate"? But do we not want our students to learn to evaluate and criticize authority? It is understandable why schools whose faculties are divided over such issues are unable to confront students with clear and consistent socialization demands. If respect for authority is a questionable goal--or accepted in a highly conditional fashion--it is unlikely that any firm socialization policies can be followed through the school.

None of this is to say that educators deliberately encourage pupil indiscipline. Such a policy would be an act of educational masochism. However, poor discipline, and the broader matter of poor citizenship, are not essentially the outcomes of pupils being urged to act badly. These forms of misconduct first arise because people are not told what they should and should not do in a clear, firm and persuasive manner. And when there is not general agreement over what pupils should do, it is understandable why teachers end up being frustrated by pupil indiscipline.

In the interest of clarity, we should emphasize that, technically speaking, schools always socialize their students. There is simply good or bad socialization. Students can be socialized to wholesome values, or can just as well be socialized into indifferences to academic work, selfishness,

or resentment towards legitimate authority. Thus, schools can never refuse their socialization roles as long as they enroll students for any period of time: the only issue is what types of socialization they will generate.

These concealed controversies over the socialization priorities of our schools can be moderated by the application of deduction. In other words, we propose to first abstractly reason about what schools should do, and how they should do it. Our vision of the ideal is not largely our invention. It is the unarticulated perspective of many citizens, parents and professionals, and it has roots in a substantial body of traditional and contemporary literature (Dewey, 1944, pp. 1-23; Durkheim, 1973; Eisenstadt, 1956; Meyers, 1960). This point of view is the starting point for our arguments related to (a) the socialization of students in schools towards effective adult life, and (b) the central role of the principal in that process. After presenting these arguments, we will describe how we are using them as a basis for our ongoing research.

The Socialization Approach

As the core of our theoretical framework, we propose a theorem: A school is a site where a number of adults work together over a period of years to earn their livings through preparing--or socializing--children of others who attend the site to participate in adult society. This theorem, or intellectual premise, leads naturally to a number of rough corollaries:

1. The adults should work together, and there should be systems for fostering cooperation.

2. The adults work for an employer, and there should be systems of supervision and accountability as well as forms of work incentives.
3. The children should be socialized to adulthood in a society largely like the one we live in now. That is, they will work for their livings, live in their communities, marry and rear children, and make contributions to help their various communities succeed. Not every student must fit into a pre-determined social and vocational niche as an adult, but there must be high probability that certain patterns of conduct and choice will occur.
4. Since the students are children and adolescents, they should not be treated as if they are adults, but rather they should be under the general supervision of adults.
5. Since the students are being socialized to adulthood, there should be a logical and plausible relationship between the activities they undertake in school and their ultimate adulthood. Presumably, the school tasks the students undertake should gradually come closer to those of adulthood as they move through schooling.
6. The school, in its operation, should be careful to respect the aspirations of parents for their children as well as the obligations of parents towards their children.
7. The school should strive to foster humane relations among its inhabitants and with the parents of the students.

It is inevitable that some of the rules derived from these corollaries will conflict with each other. If a teacher is not doing his work well, and persists in such conduct, can he or she always be "humanely" dismissed? Suppose a parent's aspirations for a child is unrealistically high, or in appropriately low--how are such wishes "respected"? When should students be assigned certain responsibilities? Despite the problems of determining answers to such issues, it is important that adults in the school community handle issues that arise with some degree of consistency, or activities can become uncoordinated. This means that powerful systems must exist for creating commonalities of perspective, and that they must be managed by energetic, perceptive and articulate people who exercise considerable discretion and leadership. In schools where effective student socialization is occurring, in our terms, such persons will fill the role of principal.

The theorem, and its resulting corollaries, may be characterized as a socialization approach to education (Cohen, 1964; Durkheim, 1973; Wynne, 1977). But it should be recognized that the approach deals with socialization to adulthood--a particular form of socialization--and that it implicitly assumes that such socialization includes acquisition of a significant cognitive skill and knowledge. The socialization approach is ecologically oriented, since it is sensitive to the fact that schools are institutions in which young people spend significant parts of their lives (Bronfenbrenner, 1980; Skinner, 1971).

The socialization approach is essentially an adaptation of a continuity perspective to the imperatives of a metropolitan, industrialized, democratic society. In older societies, the teachers--or mentors--around growing

children were relatives, employers, and neighbors (Aries, 1962; Esienstadt, 1956; Whiting and Whiting, 1975). These persons managed children's socialization to adulthood as part of a cluster of responsibilities which incidentally encompassed child care. But in our contemporary society, with its divisions of labor, much of the management of socialization to adulthood is in the hands of paid educators, a class of specialists. As a result, some conceptual adaptations must be made to permit the imperatives of social reproduction to be satisfied. The theorem and corollaries represent such an effort.

In practice, the approach means that, if the students are going to be good citizens in a society largely similar to our own, it is logical to encourage them to be patriotic, and to salute the flag. The salute symbolically signifies the continuity of social tradition. Or, if they will work as adults on jobs where there are dress requirements--which is often the situation--they should be subject to equivalent dress codes in school.

The socialization approach implies that an elaborate network of variables must be controlled by persons who have on-site responsibility for managing good schools--and these persons are principals. Without such control, it is impossible for the subtle coordination needed for effective site management to occur.

There is a possibility that readers may see the socialization approach as a collection of truisms. However, we must reiterate that many influential persons and institutions oppose the day-to-day operation of this approach. Teachers' unions and tenure hampers the exercises of the principal's authority, the courts are uncertain about compelling flag salutes by students,

groups of teachers (especially in high schools) often become more subject-centered than pupil-centered, administrators underrate the importance of pupil discipline as a goal, and so on. As James S. Coleman observed, to many citizens, especially parents, their public schools have come under "alien control (Coleman, 1981, p. 161)."

The Legitimacy of Continuity

Social continuity is a central element of the socialization approach. Most Americans recognize the general propriety of fostering social continuity. None of us would criticize the Sioux Indians because they did not rear their children to be Mandans, and when contemporary Poles try to socialize their children to traditional Polish nationalism, although their government is Communist and their country is now dominated by Russia, we see this as quite natural. We may be critical of the values of other societies, but we do not seriously expect the adults in those societies to rear their children as if they were going to live in our own culture or another one. When teachers give character building a low priority--the last of twelve goals--they are depreciating social continuity. Personal character connotes the acceptance of obligations, a sense of commitment, a dedication to the long haul. It is a central element of social continuity.

The acceptance of social continuity does not mean there will never be change. But most historical studies demonstrate that persistence is the central element of social evolution. Thus, a socialization process (in schools or elsewhere) managed with a special sympathy for anticipated changes will tend to make the average citizen uncomfortable. Indeed, suppose we

visited another culture, and met someone (bucking the society) seriously trying to socialize some children to live in a hypothetical, yet-to-be-born environment. We would be prone to view this adult as an isolate, or crank. We might also wonder about the morality of enlisting (or drafting) uninformed children into such an exposed venture. Finally, we might study seriously the motives of this adult enemy of the mainstream, to see whether his unusual conduct was due to altruism, or some covert self-interest. After all, the Pied Paper was basically a spiteful person.

The Socialization Approach: Its Critics

The socialization theorem we have proposed and many of its corollaries--or their operational implications--have been subject to heated contemporary intellectual and public debate. The controversy is reflected in a variety of propositions that are urged regarding education. For instance, it is commonplace for academic discussion about teaching to treat teachers as if they were--or should be--relatively independent professionals, like lawyers in private practices, as contracted with members of a team led by a powerful leader (Haberman and Stinnett, 1973; and Mayers, 1973). Some writers have talked about the obligation of education to rear new generations prepared to significantly restructure our society (Postman, 1969). Of course, it may be true that the world will not change much, but it is also true that many groups and individuals say they want it to change in significant fashions. And, in innumerable ways, these pro-change advocates affect the nature of educational programs and policies.

At a political level, our policies of school bounding--both neighborhood schools and mandatory busing--lessen parental control through constraining family choice among schools. Some recent court decisions represent another challenge to the socialization approach, inasmuch as they have required school administrators, and particularly principals, to spend an inordinate amount of time in handling student discipline cases. The decisions, and their procedural implications, tend to ignore the often subtle and negative impact of strident due process on other desirable school policies (Kirp and Yudolf, 1974).

It is a truism that socialization has shifted from being a community function to being an institutional function. As a consequence, a number of the homeostatic and incentive systems affecting socialization which have existed in traditional environments have been muted. The persistence of the socialization approach has been threatened particularly by the conflicts of segmented interest groups which are more effective in pressing their various claims in institutional settings than they once were in the community at large (Wise, 1979). Teachers and principals in many schools have not lost interest in the socialization approach and in social continuity, but they must accommodate increasingly to the numbing clash of special interest groups in the boundaries of the school community.

The implicit depreciation of the socialization approach is further demonstrated by trends underway in much of the so-called effective school research. Thus, a recent publication of the Detroit Public Schools (Planning Department, 1981) summarized much of this research. The review emphasized that the "instructional" role of the principal was central to school operation.

Similarly, in the review school priorities for teachers, parents, and students were related almost exclusively to cognitive learning in classrooms via a basic skills instruction, and the monitoring of student academic achievement. The review gave only modest attention to the other side of the socialization coin: the essential character development of the child which must accompany intellectual development. Of course, effective socialization--a somewhat broader view than effective instruction--must be concerned with literacy. But it must also deal with the transmission of values, interpersonal and social skills, and attitudes.

The Socialization Approach: Its Friends

There is a coherent public perspective related to the socialization approach. Ironically, though most citizens have only a general opinion of what schools should be doing, the implicit premises underlying their general opinions about schools and schooling are consonant with a socialization approach. The public has listed discipline explicitly as the major issue confronting schools in thirteen of the fourteen national Gallup Polls (1982) related to the schools. Again, in 1975, 57% of the public respondents to one of these polls, when asked to choose the characteristics of a desirable school, selected good discipline, a focus on basic education, and a dress code (Elam, 1978, p. 228). These opinions are consistent with a view of many students, as revealed in a 1979 Gallup Poll (1979) which reported that 53% of the young respondents in a national sample listed either discipline or student drug use as the major problem confronting schools. The application of dress standards, attention to student discipline, and assurance that students work

hard are important elements of the socialization function of the school as we define it. Furthermore, the concept of basic education requires that adults determine the major priorities for children and youth in the schools.

Beyond the matter of public aspirations, it is also true that some contemporary educators do operate schools in ways deliberately consonant with the socialization approach. One study, now underway in Chicago, asks school principals questions such as these: Are copies of the school rules placed into the hands of most or all parents? Are students routinely given relatively rigorous homework? Are students regularly expected to go out of their way to be of help to other student, or members of the school community? Are such acts of pro-social conduct evaluated and rewarded, just as might occur in the case of academic learning? The questions were developed or approved by a body largely composed of practising educators, both in public and private schools (For Character, 1983). These educators essentially believed that such questions dealt with important aspects of good school administrations. In another Chicago study concerned with equivalent issues, a principal of a Chicago public high school was asked the question, "Who makes the discipline rules in this school"? He gave the following answer (Wynne, 1980a, p. 126):

The rules were made by a committee headed by the assistant principal in charge of discipline. That person got input from the assistant principals in charge of student activities and curriculum, along with the director of counselors. There is also representation from the teaching staff and the student government organization.

The principal emphasized that, as principal, he reserved the right to make the final determination on what did and did not become a rule; also the prerogative to add rules that he saw as necessary for maintaining the qualities of a good

school. This answer is quite consonant with the principles articulated in Corollary 7. Furthermore, if one examines the nine other descriptive items on this school (Wynne, 1980a) it is evident that the school meets the objectives generally implicit in the socialization approach. From the same approach, it is also easy to identify numerous schools which do not apply a socialization approach).

We also should be sensitive to some intellectual currents now affecting education research. Some effective school researchers have essentially used socialization approaches--but in an implicit fashion. These researchers have examined pools of schools, analyzed the level of their cognitive learning outcomes through quantitative techniques, and concluded that the more productive schools were--in effect--applying a socialization approach in their day-to-day operations. However, the effective school researchers usually looked at relatively similar schools, that were overly distinguished from each other by their divergent cognitive learning outcomes, such as variation in reading scores (Brookover, 1977; Rutter, 1978; Venezky and Winfield, 1979; Wellisch, 1978). Due to the other similarities among these schools, the researchers were able to make distinctions without having to investigate or defend the other patterns of operation which have created distinctions among such schools. The researchers simply said things such as "schools which had good reading scores also had effective discipline (Mann, 1980)." They did not have to go on further and say that such discipline was desirable, per se (Rutter, 1978). However, this research invites us to build from reading outcomes to deduce the merits of other socialization related practices (Guba, 1978).

Nonetheless, we feel constrained by the methodology of such effective school studies. They compel us to ignore many school outcomes which we regard as important--student character development, the level of school discipline, teacher/parent/pupil relations. They disregard the nature of the processes prevailing in the school, and yet it is finally essential for us to identify and analyze those processes if we are to make any useful prescriptions. (For one example of a more broadly based, and controversial, effort, see Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore, 1982). Furthermore, research which neglects to categorize and define processes will not stimulate our own thinking as to what should be occurring in a good school. One virtue of starting with an intellectual premise about the characteristics of a desired school is that it heightens our sensitivity about how an institution should be working. Some of the semi-philosophical disputes about research may be more significant than the problematic data finally collected.

Research Objectives

Our research objectives were derived from our commitment to the socialization principle. From this principle, we identified and listed a number of observable policies and practices which should be found in a "good" school. This list was developed in a semi-heuristic fashion: the socialization principle was used to guide observation and interviewing, then the data were considered, the socialization principle was reanalyzed, additional list items were developed, and the cycle reiterated. Eventually, a checklist of several hundred items was developed (Wynne, 1980 (b)). With respect to cognitive learning, this list has many parallels with those

developed (and being applied) by other effective school researchers (see, e.g., Villanova, 1981). With respect to broader socialization concerns, the list has a comparatively unique emphasis, e.g., it is concerned with pupil dress, the ceremonial life of the school, many details about pupil discipline, the level of student pro-social conduct in the school, extra-curricular activities. Our aim, in developing the list, was to use it as a tool for identifying and describing good schools.

Next, we wanted to find out how the principals of such schools had been trained into their special roles. We recognized that good schools might exist without assertive leadership by a principal, if the faculty and family mobilize themselves to collectively provide coherence necessary for good school operation. However, important differences often exist among educators about school priorities (which differences we have already discussed). Thus, it seems unlikely that many good American schools can persist without the leadership of an effective principal. Furthermore, at this time, the trend among both professionals and the public is to further emphasize the centrality of the principal's role. As a result, the importance of the principal in school management is likely to increase. To some degree, our focus on the centrality of the principal is consonant with other examples of effective school research. But, as already mentioned, most of this research essentially focuses on cognitive themes.

We assumed the training received by good principals was essentially some form of socialization: that is, it was transmitted by pervasive, reiterated, incidental and deliberate processes, which often worked through emotion-affecting techniques. Presumably, much of this deep-seated learning occurred

before our subjects actually became principals. If we could better describe such processes, we might move towards training and identifying more able principalship candidates.

Data Sources

The data are being generated in a two-step process: selecting the schools, and interviewing the principals of the schools selected. The sites being covered include public and private, urban and suburban, elementary and secondary schools in a large metropolitan area. The sample is not random, but it is relatively representative of the good schools in the area. Twenty principals and their school communities will be the data sources. Prior knowledge of the two investigators, as well as information gleaned from a wide variety of colleagues, is being used in the identification of potential principals. If a school visit by the investigators indicates that the school does not exhibit a joint concern for student cognitive and character development, the principal and the school will be eliminated from the sample. The investigators estimate the chosen schools will be representative of perhaps twenty percent of the schools in the United States. The subjects in this study will include principals of both secular and church-related schools, since there are obvious virtues to cross-checking some of the data and insights collected from public schools. In addition to interviewing our twenty exemplary principals, we also plan to interview several principals of less effective schools, as a form of a control group.

Data Collection

Our data are derived from visual observations in and around the school; interviews of students and staff; the collection and analysis of diverse school documents (e.g., student newspapers, written discipline codes, staff handbooks, tabulations of reading scores and curriculum guides); and two or more in-depth interviews of the principal. These data are weighted against the aforementioned checklist. Ten such visits and interviews will be conducted by the principal investigators. In addition, ten more visits and interviews will be completed by students working under the supervision of the investigators.

Data Analysis

Content analysis is being applied to the interviews to permit the identification of recurrent and consistent themes. This analysis is supplemented by the scrutiny of notes related to in-school observations, school documents, and informal interviews with other school participants. Considerable attention is dedicated to the early experiences of the subjects; the kinds of elementary and secondary schools they attended; their in and out of family adult role models; and their experiences in community and church activities, paid employment and competitive athletics. Their personal values and skills are identified, and the relationship between those factors and their styles of school management are explored. Interview schedules are supplemented in second interviews by questions emanating from the school observation and from the reactions of each principal.

Our emphasis on more qualitative and ethnographic approaches of analysis has assisted our focus on the early personal and professional experiences of

the principals in this sample. One contribution of this first part of the study are our findings on the socialization of the principals themselves into adulthood and into professional life. Our analysis of the relationship between the socialization of good principals, and the ways they run good schools, is not yet complete. Still, at this state, an important preliminary hypothesis has begun to emerge: good principals may tend to come from family and community environments which socialize them to the skills and values associated with fostering community and comfortably exercising strong authority.

Findings

In the balance of this paper, we will portray in some detail the socialization of one man into the role of urban secondary principal. We will present information regarding his school. In conclusion we will discuss several values and attitudes which appear to be critical in the presence of this principal. These values and attitudes were present in the other principals of good schools whom we studied so far as well, sometimes to a greater extent and sometimes to a lesser extent. Their presence in each case suggests they are crucial to effective leadership in the good school.

We are very aware of the discredited trait theory of leadership--the proposition that leadership is the sum of various inborn traits, of general applicability, (Stogdill, 1981). Our research does not mark a return to such arguments. The values and attitudes of principals that are identified as important in our research are not innate traits as much as they are the acquired perspectives. They have developed over a lifetime of complex

socialization and through contact with varied role models. Furthermore, they have been tested and refined in the fire of institutional life. As a consequence, the important values and attitudes that we have identified determine the relationship between the principal and the school. As an example, Sarason (1982) has been concerned about the locus of control for the principal and the view of the system that the principal holds. In holding such concerns, he is particularly interested in how they influence the behavior of the principal as manager of the school. Once again, we are not interested in vague, inherent generalized traits, but rather specific values and attitudes present in principals who lead good schools.

One Principal's Story

I was born and raised in Nashville, Tennessee. My parents sent me to a Catholic elementary school, staffed by sisters from the Order of the Blessed Sacrament. Almost all of the pupils in the school were black, and most of them were non-Catholics. Blacks sent their children to the school because they felt the sisters were competent and demanding. And let me tell you, those sisters were tough. For example, you can note that even though I was raised in the South, I do not talk with a black accent. It's not a big thing, but it just signifies that the sisters were determined to have us talk like whites, and to fit in the world wherever we might choose. The sisters made sure that we toed the mark, showed respect, and did our work.

While I was attending elementary school, my stepfather was working as a laborer and later as a mechanic in a foundry. I remember helping him out on a night shift assignment when I was twelve. As I grew older, my father

gradually increased his work skills, and expanded his ambitions. By the time I was in high school, he was in business for himself as a contractor. And, while I attended school, and during summer vacation, I would work for him on his job.

After completing elementary school, I attended public high school in Nashville. You asked where I acquired my writing ability, and there's a story there. In the high school I attended, my class had the same English teacher for three years. She was the wife of a medical doctor, and partly viewed her job as a hobby--anyway, she didn't do it for the money. She used part of her salary to buy the best instructional devices for her class, and gave us demanding attention. In that class, each student had his seat location determined by his performance on her tests--and the seating order ran from 1 to 35. This went on for the whole three years. And you can bet that the 35th student, up to the last day, was always trying to figure out what to do so he could become 34, and have someone else become 35. Anyway, I always felt that the demands of that class had a lot to do with my skills in writing.

While I was in school, my parents encouraged my interest in music, and I eventually ended-up being proficient in both piano and organ. When I completed school, I was awarded a piano and organ scholarship to Fisk University. At about this time, I began to supplement my part-time contracting work by playing gigs with various small music combos.

In both high school and college, I was also very interested in athletics, and played in several interscholastic sports. I still follow sports to this day, and play tennis fairly regularly. And sports has proved a good way of relating to a lot of my high school students--both by talking to them about it, and by showing up at, and enjoying school games.

At Fisk, I decided to major in chemistry, and successfully earned my B.S. there. It is interesting to know that my stepfather graduated from college with his own B.A. the same year that I graduated from Fisk. As you can guess, my stepfather was an able and purposeful man, and played an important part in shaping my style and aspirations. When I graduated, the draft was still in progress, and I was drafted into the Army. In the Army, I decided to try for Officers Candidate School. An important stimulant for my decision was my resentment at the racial discrimination I sensed around me in the Army. I felt provoked to show them that I was a capable person, and should be respected as such. I felt that becoming an officer would insure I received that respect. In deciding to apply, I was accepting a twofold challenge: the inherent difficulty at OCS, and my expectations that they would be especially tough towards blacks.

Officers Candidate School ran for six months, and was very tough. The entering class, after a process of careful selection, totalled 176. Seven of these candidates were black. By the end of the six months, there were 66 members left; three of us were blacks. The whole procedure was designed to generate stress. It's hard to say which portions of that stress were "natural," and which were specially aimed at we blacks. One stress generating device I recall was the requirement that each candidate periodically rate in writing all the other members in his unit, and justify his ratings. Since you were being trained for leadership, it was expected that your ratings of others would be objective and thoughtful--and, at the same time, you realized that your buddies were also rating you. The whole process was logical, but it could make one uncomfortable--especially when you realized that these ratings

might be used to select-out people from the program. Another episode I remember was when one black friend of mine in the school, an ex-football star, was being ordered around by some other candidate, a Georgia white, who was in command of our platoon that day. The Georgia man said, "Boy, you pick up that broom and get sweeping." I could see my friend on the edge of a disastrous explosion against his tormentor. I stepped over between the two of them, and told my friend, "You heard what the man said. Get going." My friend's eyes almost popped, but he got started sweeping, successfully completed the course, and he and I still stay in touch with each other.

When I completed the course, I was commissioned, and at the age of twenty-one was in command of a guided missile battery. There were 300 men in the battery, and most of them were white.

While I was in the Army, my parents had moved north to Chicago. After being discharged, I visited them there. In Chicago, for awhile I worked as a "tester" for the Urban League, and applied for jobs or homes which the League suspected were being denied to blacks. Eventually, I decided to do graduate work in biology, and enrolled in a graduate school connected with a hospital. While I was in the school, I also worked as a research assistant.

I should mention that I've always liked practical jokes, and kidding around in general. There's a story about my lab job that might illustrate this point. While I worked in the lab, I wore a lab coat. One day, I noticed that people were staring at me in a strange fashion as I walked about work. Finally, I looked behind myself, and discovered that a tail (cut from a laboratory rat) was hanging from the back pocket of my jacket--held by a pin. One of my co-workers had put it there as a joke. I determined to try and discover who did it and to get back at him.

Eventually, I decided I was pretty sure who did it. In planning my vengeance, I noticed he left the lab each day carrying an attache case, and travelled home on the subway. Sometimes, I even ended-up on the same train as he did. Near the end of one work day, I took several live lab rats, and injected them with a sedative. Then, sneaking off with my victim's attache case, I put the sedated rats in the case. In a while, the owner picked up the case, and walked off to the train. I followed at an appropriate distance. After a couple of stops on the crowded train, my victim noticed some noises in his case, since the sedative had worn off, and he picked up the case and opened it for inspection. The four rats dashed out, and ran about the cars. Pandemonium burst out. A couple of the rats were even stepped on by squealing riders. My victim never "knew" the source of his ratty trick, but I'm sure he had his suspicions.

Part of my lab responsibilities involved doing research, and I worked with one professor on a significant project. Eventually, we wrote up the results, and I realized he was going to try and get them published in some academic journal. This was a common practice. But, when they did get published, I was surprised to discover that only his name was mentioned in the article--he took all the credit. This made me extremely angry. The incident finally caused me to decide that I did not want to pursue a possible research career any longer. I didn't want to spend several years in an environment where I might be subject to such victimization, nor did I like the idea of finally working with such selfish colleagues.

I should mention that, when I first came to Chicago, I enlisted in the Army Reserve, and went to periodic drills. This activity led to my next

career shift. While I was in the Reserve, I became acquainted with an older black reserve officer who was then principal of a Chicago public school; he projected a sense of purpose and determination. He got a good impression about me as a result of the lesson I designed and presented to his unit on some chemical warfare matter. Despite our moderate age difference, we gradually saw we had a lot in common and became friends. He kept trying to persuade me to leave graduate school and go into public school teaching--with the idea that I would probably end up in administration. When I finally did decide to leave graduate work in biology, I took his advice and went into teaching in the Chicago Public Schools. In fact, I began as a chemistry teacher in my friend's own school.

At the time this happened, the schools were short of formally qualified teachers, and it was not too difficult for me to begin work as a substitute. Within a couple of years, I discovered I was doing as much administration as teaching, since my friend arranged for me to fill in various semi-administrative positions which developed. As I got further into education, I began to realize how some of my own attitudes affected my approach to administrative work. One of my attitudes is that problems never end, but just change. I was paid to try and solve things, but I would only kid myself if I thought that any solution I could effect could create a permanently tranquil and efficient situation. All you can hope to do is to solve today's problems, so that you can get ready for the ones that will come tomorrow.

Another disposition of mine is to try and control the environment around me. When I first became a principal, I was assigned to a disorderly school in a tough neighborhood. There was a lot of teacher turnover in the school. At

the beginning of every year, when I had to get new teachers, I was supposed to wait for the teachers assigned to me by the downtown office of the Board. But many of these teachers weren't any good, and some of the better ones refused to work at my school when they saw the neighborhood situation. What I did was go down to the Board personnel office while teachers were being processed through their examinations. I'd look over the applicants, see if they had shoes on (I say this half-jokingly; things were rough fifteen years ago), and if they could talk sensibly. If they seemed interesting, I'd tell them about my school, and its problems and possibilities. If any of them nibbled, I'd offer to take them right down to the school in my car--which was outside--so they could see things first hand. After our trip, if they still were interested and good prospects, I'd help them through the hiring procedure, and have them assigned to my school. This way, I gradually managed to collect some able teachers.

You have to realize that during this time--in the 1960's--the schools were forced to hire many marginal people. When I was doing my M.A. work at the Department of Education at the University of Chicago, I tabulated the numbers of teachers in one Chicago school who had obtained status without passing the National Teachers Exam. The figure was 58 out of 78. The point is that substitutes who worked regularly (because no qualified teachers were available) would obtain tenure even if they could not pass a relatively easy cognitive exam. Many of these teachers are still in the system today.

I might mention that my graduate work at the University of Chicago did not give me respect for the practical perspective of much of the faculty. I remember one evening when I came to graduate class, after a student had been

shot in a fight outside my school. In the class, I brought up the incident for discussion, as an instance of one urban education problem. I also mentioned that I was concerned with keeping down three different gangs that were fighting around my school. The professor's remark was, "I've never been in that situation, so you have to be the expert." Perhaps his remark was true, but I did not find it very encouraging.

My mother once said to me that "If you had gone into the ministry, you would have become the most wealthy black minister in America." She meant that my talents and style--being friendly, assertive, organized, and interested in peoples' values and motivation--were especially adapted to the community roles often undertaken by black ministers. Maybe she was right. But I like to think that many of those talents are also required in education.

Another style of mine which came into play as an administrator was my willingness to accept and live with confrontation. When I was young, people had confronted me--my teachers, my parents, the people around me in the Army. Thus, when I was thirteen, and going out on my first date, my father gave me some prophylactics, and also some advice, "Son, never go to bed with someone unless you're prepared to marry her." That conversation may have been a little heavy for my age, but part of its message was that I should start to think about relationships in a mature fashion. I think it showed my stepfather as thoughtful and caring. As I grew older, I also saw that unless I confronted people, I couldn't take control of situations. And so I've usually fought for things which I think are important. And you have to fight both up and down. I remember how, as a principal, I spent one whole Saturday morning--in between games of tennis--arguing with my then boss to retain one

clerk on my school payroll. I felt that this clerk was a key person on my staff. At one stage in the argument he said to me, "One of these days I'm going to take your salary to pay one of these people who's jobs you're saving." I finally won my debate by saying that either they (the people downtown) were not just paying my boss to be their g__d__ flunky, but to think, decide and argue. If he disagreed with them, and agreed with me, he had to stand up in order to earn his salary. And I kept the clerk.

Right now, in this school, we have a security officer (paid with federal funds) who is worth his weight in gold. We all call him Starsky, after the television show character. He's really terrific in controlling the kids--firm, but with a wry sense of humor. His job is being phased out due to funding changes. I don't really care about the federal program, but I do want to keep Starsky. And so I'm wracking my brain to find some angle or gimmick. We'll see.

But confronting people below you even can be harder than confrontation up--especially in schools. Many of the people upstairs are smart enough to let differences be forgotten. But the people below you bear grudges and are very hard to get rid of. For instance, in this school, I was hired in preference to the former acting principal--who lacked formal certification for the principalship. Despite this lack, he had stimulated student and parent support for his ambition. And so my designation as principal frustrated his active campaign. Furthermore, some of his supporters looked at me in an unfriendly light. None of this was helped by my efforts to tighten up things (in the school) that had been running too loosely. After I was hired, my rival stayed on as assistant principal. This kept him in the running for my

job, and enabled him to earn more money than he would've earned in any other available job in the system. For three and a half years, I had this man around me, and he didn't make things easy. Eventually I accumulated enough evidence to confront him, and say, "Either you go elsewhere easily or you'll be forced out." And he then went without fighting. But I had to build up a case.

The Christmas card story is another confrontation episode. Last Christmas, for the first time, I sent personal notes (with my regular Christmas cards) to the school staff members who were doing especially good work. Twenty-seven of the staff of one hundred sixty received such notes. Naturally, the word got around, and I saw that the notes generated a definite tension towards me among some non-receivers--those with what I'd call a "union mentality". But I think the tension is a healthy sign, and will continue this new policy next year. Good people deserve and want special recognition.

Of course, running a large school, I can't get involved in most pupil problems, but I intervene where I feel it is vital. I recall one situation where some adults wanted to persuade me to register a young Chinese boy who just got in from Formosa, and who had very poor English. The problem was to estimate whether he could handle our curriculum. We didn't have a written intelligence test in Chinese. I played a game of chess, and decided that he had the necessary intellectual aptitude. He eventually graduated with honors. Another student, who had many academic problems, had considerable artistic talent. He did complete school, and then got a scholarship with the Chicago Art Institute. We were on good terms, and he came by frequently to chat, and to seek advice. Once he told me he was having trouble making dates with the

girl students at the Institute. He said, "I guess what the teachers here said is true: I have a communication problem." We both laughed. Eventually, he managed to bring his communication skills more into line with his artistic ones. Two years ago, he graduated from the Yale University School of Fine Arts with an advanced degree. Of course, not all my contacts involve happy incidents. Just a couple of days ago, I met with the mother of a male pupil who had been involved in several incidents of stealing in the school. We had a frank talk, and we both agreed that her son was prone to get himself into trouble, and that he was surrounded with too many peer group temptations in his home neighborhood. The mother had decided to send him away to Mississippi to attend school. I think that's an appropriate plan; whether it will work, we'll see.

One of my persistent concerns in managing this school is to try and improve the character, as well as academic performance, of the students. Each child has one long homeroom period each week, and I urge the faculty to use this time to talk to the students about character-related matters. Many of the students are ambitious but need to improve their sense of community obligations. So many of them are willing to steal or commit vandalism in the school. I understand that there are many forces out in the community which stimulate such misconduct. Still, as an educator and mature adult, I realize that such conduct is wrong and self-destructive to the young people involved. So I do whatever I can to fight such trends.

An important source of my feedback about school operations is through conversations with students. I attend most games, often eat lunch in the students' lunchroom, and kid around with students in the hall. Such contacts

help me get a good feel of what's happening throughout the school. Of course, I don't believe everything the students say to me, but if I hear things that trouble me, I follow up. Students also know that I am accessible if they want to be heard. My contacts with students also remind me of an principle I apply about the schools: all adults in schools are important for affecting students--not only teachers, but also security guards, lunchroom aides, janitors and clerks. They all count. And so I try and keep informed about what all of them are doing, and when anyone, anywhere, is doing a good job, I try and let them know it is appreciated.

You ask about my sources of information and learning. I'm active in several professional groups, including the Chicago Black Principals Association, Chicago Principals Association, The National Association of Secondary School Principals, and The American Association of School Administrators. Naturally, I receive various professional bulletins from them, and I try to stay on top of this information. At this time, I'm also interested in the application of computers in schools, for either instructional or administrative purposes, and so I'm thinking of taking a course in this area. I have a doctorate, which was obtained from a graduate school which I know many academics do not hold in high regard. But I took their program not because it might be easy, but because it fit into my work schedule, and could be concentrated into the summer months. One original element of that program is that it brings together high calibre graduate students and practicing administrators to talk and work in intensive conferences. I don't know about the academic significance of such activities, but I personally found the experience stimulating and rewarding. It was good

to talk shop with such able people in a focussed situation. Another learning activity they conducted was to have each student go through an intense eight hour simulation of an administrative situation, under the eye of trained observers. The simulation was a real test for me, and I found the analyses of the observers sound and provocative. Essentially, they concluded that I had good judgement and poise, but that I was not careful enough with some elements of detail work. And I think they're right there.

As for my future ambitions, I'd like to become a school district superintendent someplace and see how I handle the challenges of such a job.

Facts About the School

The School is part of the Metropolitan public school system. It is a 9-12 co-ed high school with a 99% black student body. It has 2,500 students, 123 teachers, 20 other professionals, plus clerks, lunchroom staff, and other employees. Technically, the school is designated as a vocational school, and draws its students from an attendance area encompassing the boundaries of several comprehensive public high schools. Because of its technical emphasis, students are required to pass a moderately rigorous entrance exam, to insure they can handle the math involved in some of the shop courses. In practice, unusually high proportions of its students go on to four year colleges, and they are all strongly encouraged to take math, English and a foreign language to increase their college marketability.

There is a conspicuous sign outside the school, clearly visible to passing cars, which displays the school's symbol, its name, and its slogan. And the same recitations are contained on the cover of glossly folders (for

holding papers) which are distributed to all students. Printed inside the folder is a clear outline of the school's discipline code, class schedules, and other procedures governing students. The folder also contains several brief and persuasive statements giving the rationale for the school's procedures. For instance, with regard to absences, it states: "Each student's attendance record in school is very important. College admission offices and future employers will carefully evaluate your attendance record." The text also points out that student vandalism actually destroys the property which all students (and their families) own and have helped to create via their tax payments. The school has a full program of interscholastic sports, both for boys and girls, and there are many signs around the building publicizing these activities.

During passing time in the halls, there is a bustling but disciplined atmosphere. In the lunchroom, during the first part of the day, there is a small crowd of students, serving the detentions (which they have received for discipline violations) during the previous twenty-four hours. The discipline time is served either before or after class time each day.

In the front part of the school, an aide sits as a guard to control access to the school (through the only regularly opened doors to the street). Visitors are asked to identify themselves and to go promptly to their destination. Students who are walking through the halls while classes are in session are asked to show their passes, or otherwise identify themselves. Students are required to wear their identification cards on their persons at all times (in visible locations) to facilitate control over unauthorized persons (who would not have such cards to display). On the day of our first

visit, which was a Monday, about 60-70% of such students showed such cards during passing time. We were advised by the principal that the percentage would considerably improve as the week went on. It was evident that, apart from passing time, close control was maintained to inhibit students or strangers from wandering throughout the halls.

The procedures to be followed by faculty in their work are outlined in a handbook which is relatively complete and precise in its language. Copies of the handbook are distributed to all faculty. There are parallels between the tone of the faculty handbook and the instructions to students, eg., the text is clear, the language is polite but firm. Faculty members receive the following instructions about student attendance. "At the end of each 10 week period, the division teacher will prepare a list of students who have a record of perfect attendance, with no tardiness to any class. This list is to be submitted to the Attendance Office. A letter of congratulations will be sent to the parents of these students."

The handbook contains a relatively thorough discussion of the grading policies to be applied by faculty members. The tone of the discussion makes it clear that teachers should closely monitor their students' work; students should be well-informed of the grading criteria; the grades given should be closely related to the work tasks assigned students; students (and their parents) should be given advance notice of potential inadequacies in their work; and the work assigned to students should challenge them at their various levels of competence, e.g., high achievers should be given more elaborate learning activities.

Each department of the school administers uniform annual departmental exams to the students taking courses in the department. This procedure was adopted in the past year. The procedure was mandated by the principal, after consulting with his staff. At the time of the mandate, it was emphasized to the staff that the exams would not be used to "control" faculty or curriculum--but the principal mentioned this qualification to the interviewers with an ironic smile. He obviously viewed the exam as a tactful, but constructive step towards monitoring both the learning of students and the teaching of the faculty.

In many classrooms, there are various signs of stress on academics. Announcements are posted about the importance of mid-term exams, the dates they will be held, and the consequences of poor grades on such exams. Technical drawings, and other exhibits of students' work, are posted in the classrooms and halls, and awards (for academic and technical work) won in citywide contests are prominently displayed. In shop and design classes, different means are used to demonstrate the relevance of the subject matter. Some of the shops are operated on a commercial basis, and customers (both faculty, students, and people from the neighborhood) bring in their cars to be serviced, or their clothes to be cleaned, and pay the school for such services.

Some of the students come from environments where gang activity is a problem, and the school is concerned with generating a climate which lowers the appeal of such delinquency. It does this through a variety of means. Each year, it holds an assembly for all students, where the discipline code is justified and explained by the principal and his assistants. In addition,

freshman students are brought into a special assembly, where the school's resources are explained to them, and they are told, "We're here to help you, but if you have questions or problems, you have to be wise enough to ask. The school also annually evaluates and (if necessary) revises its discipline code and procedures. A supplement (to the rules on the folder) was issued during the year, and distributed and explained (during homeroom) to all students.

Examples of constructive teacher/student engagement come easily to the attention of visitors. For instance, we were standing in the school hall, near the main entrance. A woman, evidently a teacher, came by guiding a female student. The teacher advised the student that she should stay there, and keep an eye out for an expected visitor. The teacher then remarked to us that the visitor was a representative of an outside employer, who wanted to interview some prospective graduates, and possibly hire them after graduation. We asked the teacher how such hiring was doing. She said, "I am in the cooperative education program, and we tell all our students that we will try and insure they have a job before they graduate. This year, we are not doing too well. It is already February, and about 20% of our prospective June graduates are still unhired. If they don't get employer commitments soon, we will assign them to read in the library and work with them in exploring appropriate career options in the Chicago area, through skimming want ads, and other such tactics." The incident seems to reveal a high level of thoughtful concern for students.

The principal remarked that the students have school spirit, but that there was a difference between spirit and pride. "Spirit" meant that they are pleased to be in the school, and would rather be there than elsewhere. In

particular, the students thought that their school was better than the other high schools which their friends attended. "Pride" signified an affirmative identification with the school, and an active desire to make it a better place. The principal felt that the students' level of school pride could be improved. To help produce this effect, he was organizing a school slogan contest (students would be invited to submit school slogans, which would be judged, and small cash prizes given for the best ones). Winning slogans would be widely publicized throughout the school.

Despite some of the things the school had going for it (e.g., the students were screened by the entrance exam), it still has certain basic problems. The principal observed that he had insufficient intermediate staff to help him supervise the two hundred adults working in the school. Furthermore, all of his assistant principals were union members and covered by the collective bargaining agreement. This meant that their loyalties were potentially divided between their boss and their fellow union members. The school building was also used as a night school for several different programs unrelated to its daytime activities. This heavy usage affected the quality of cleanliness and order in the building.

Relevant Research

There appears to be a consistent and logical relationship between the interviewee's previous socialization, and his conduct as a good school principal. However, one is naturally driven to wonder whether that relationship is genuine, or whether one is prone to read it into the evidence. Of course, the proposition that, "As the twig is bent, so the tree inclines," is of ancient origin, and it is widely assumed to be true. In this regard, we should directly confront one issue: How do we know that such earlier experiences--let us say, before twenty one--are really so important in determining the skills and attitudes of an adult in his late forties?

The fact is that the research which clearly supports the "twig is bent" approach is relatively sparse. This is not necessarily because the proverb is false, but more because good quality research of this type is hard to do. Such research must be longitudinal and run from a subject's early childhood on into his or her mature life. It obviously takes elaborate recordkeeping and follow-up, and it becomes even more complex if a relatively large pool of subjects is involved--which would be desirable.

Of course, we have a many autobiographical and biographical anecdotes about the early achievements of persons who became famous adults. Some of these instances are fully authenticated, for instance, the remarkable letters written by John Stuart Mill before the age of ten. But we do not know how to identify other high achieving children and adolescents who did not attain high status in adult life. Again, other high achieving adults sometimes had apparently mottled records in their youths. Winston Churchill, who was a great political leader, writer and orator in adult life, only excelled in

fencing during his school days. In sum, it would take a body of elaborate and careful research to firmly authenticate the "twig is bent" approach.

But, once these qualifications are uttered, it is still correct to say that the best research available supports the research. One researcher who has specialized in monitoring and analyzing such longitudinal studies is Valliant (1977). He has concluded that the existing studies demonstrate there is a high likelihood that the talents and coping skills individuals learn and display in adolescence and early adulthood will persist and elaborate throughout the remainder of any subject's life.

Discussion

The interview has displayed a relatively consistent pattern of conduct on the part of the principal. First, we see certain thematic experiences: the principal was exposed to environments where explicit, strong, but attainable, demands are placed on him--to speak without a black accent, to help support his family, to improve his prose, to date girls in a responsible fashion. As he grows older, the level of these demands increases--to achieve in a rigorous academic field (i.e., chemistry), to handle a variety of demands (e.g., music, sports, part-time jobs), and to succeed in Officers Candidate School. Gradually, the demands shifted from being externally imposed to being personally selected.

The principal was willing to subject himself to high standards and makes similar demands on others. He participated in a test to see if employers discriminate against able black applicants. He resisted when his academic advisor refused to give him credit for his contribution to a published paper.

However, at the same time, he understood that there can be serious consequences to him in preferring such resistance; thus, when he was offended by being denied recognition for certain research, he recognized that he had to resign from the graduate work which he enjoyed. In the process of making and accepting demands, he appreciated the role of humor, and other outlets for affect (e.g., music, sports), in diminishing stress.

Gradually, because of his contact with an able and strong administrator, he was attracted to teaching and educational administration. In that career, he has continued to display many of the traits which he had evinced earlier in life. He made clear and logical demands on teachers and students. He did so in a firm and good humored fashion. The demands he placed on students and teachers were generally akin to those he had earlier confronted: not only for the acquisition of cognitive knowledge, but also for the learning of specific attitudes and modes of conduct. When his demands were resisted, he decided whether and when to fight, and did not easily go to war--because he knew it was costly. But when he fought, he fought with persistence. He enjoyed exercising power, and he relished many contacts with different types of people.

As for the role of formal education and training in his learning, it is apparent that his particular coping style--to the extent it was learned--was largely the outcome of some very basic life experiences. In other words the style became apparent relatively early in his life and was reinforced by later events and decisions. An important force which seems to be related to developing his style was his family upbringing. The schools he attended were also significant: the Catholic elementary school which stressed the

acquisition of white-middle class values, despite the lack of neighborhood support for such values; the high school English teacher who stressed application and competition; and the relatively rigorous B.S. in science. His evidently high energy level and adaptability were further refined by the diverse activities he chose to successfully pursue: music, sports, chemistry, part-time jobs, an arduous military career. The objectives he set for himself placed him in situations where his coping skills would be further sharpened. By the time he turned to work in public education, most of his basic abilities and attitudes had been molded and tested.

It is also relevant to consider how and why he came to a career in education. Partly, it was due to his rejection of other alternatives. Secondly, his contact with an able and sympathetic role model was pertinent. It is probably also significant that he was able to attain a relatively high level of responsibility in education at a fairly fast rate, without being encumbered by a variety of requirements which did not give significant weight to his existing talents, e.g., a formalistic requirement would give little consideration to his having successfully commanded an Army unit of three hundred men at age of twenty-one, but his officer friend valued his experiences and helped him to advance.

While our research is still in progress, we have tentatively determined that our final report on principal interview data will be in two parts. One will be composed of two completed interviews, such as has just been presented. The other will involve the breakdown of the bulk of our interviews into a number of categories. Each category will be specifically related to the on-the-job challenges faced by good principals. The meaning and importance of

many of the categories we have selected are indicated by the preceding interview. For instance, one of the categories is "courage". And by courage, we are not so much concerned with physical daring (though that may not be irrelevant), but rather the willingness to consciously expose oneself to circumstances which may generate serious harmful consequences--either economic, emotional, or physical. Courage is needed in managing a good school for a variety of reasons, which we need not amplify here. However, suffice it to say that our interviewee has demonstrated that he learned and practiced courage on many occasions during his life, and has used it in his school managing. Other categories we have established for our overall analysis include confrontation, conceptualization, communitarian values, and ambition.

Potential Implications for Research and Practice

More researchers should give greater attention to the socialization approach--argued in this paper--as a basic conceptual tool for school analysis. Undoubtedly, the application of this approach poses problems for researchers; for instance, it does not give sole primacy of cognitive tests as performance criteria, and the development of such tests has been one of the key concerns of much recent research. Still, though the socialization approach does increase the variables to be considered by researchers, it may also add to the significance of the research attempted, by encouraging researchers to focus on more vital factors. Furthermore, a revised focus will stimulate greater consideration and legitimacy for the education goals implicit in the socialization approach. This effect will provoke more, and more refined discussion on the important topic of appropriate education

outcomes. Such discussion can help to improve the philosophic focus of practicing educators and researchers--which may be to the benefit of all.

As for education practice, our preliminary findings emphasize the profound importance that socialization, in general, and early socialization, in particular, has in the training of effective principals. The findings also suggest that certain attitudes about community and authority are transmitted through such socialization, and that these attitudes are central to a principal's work. Sensitive interviewing can be important to people engaged in selecting potential principals, to identify whether candidates had been exposed to such socialization, or have otherwise learned such attitudes.

Our work is also relevant to persons planning the training of principals. It implies that priority should be given to affect-oriented training, as compared to more cognitive approaches. In other words, persons being trained to become principals should be socialized into their potential roles, as compared to being taught about them. The concept of "socialization" suggests a pervasive, persisting process, including many experiences which might generate strong emotional reactions, and which presents candidates with powerful and wholesome role models. To put the matter directly, the process should be closer to the modes of Officer Candidate School, as compared to graduate work, or simply serving as an experienced teacher. Like the Officer Candidate model, the process should be redesigned to offer fast track routes into the principalship for candidates with attractive (but non-educational) backgrounds. Furthermore, like any socialization process, an Officers Candidate approach will drive out certain participants, as well as training others. The peculiar virtue of the proposed "driving out" system is that it

may do a better job of disqualifying than the current principalship training processes. The present system gives perhaps excessive stress to putting in time and displaying formalistic academic skills. This current pattern may constitute a form of irrelevant competition--which tends to drive out the strong, and retain the weak.

It may be true, at this time, that many of our effective principals are already more the product of effective socialization than of formal instruction. However, it is notorious that many practicing principals are not effective. Thus, we need to find and train more effective ones. Given this reality, it is important that we pay close attention to better modes of recruitment, training, and selection for principals. Our preliminary findings indicate that the current modes can be improved through becoming more conscious about what good schools should be doing and why; giving greater attention to background-oriented interviewing; fast track perspectives in advancement (for appropriate candidates); and an "officer candidate type" socialization process.

Reference

- Aries, P. Centuries of childhood. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1962.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. "Making human beings human." Character, 1980, 2, 1-8.
- Brookover, W., et al. School can make a difference. Lansing, Mich.: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, 1977.
- Cohen, Y. The transition from childhood to adolescence. Chicago: Aldine, 1964.
- Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. Public and private schools. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Coleman, J. S. "Quality and Equality in American Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 1981.
- Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press, 1944.
- Durkheim, E. Moral education. New York: The Free Press, 1944.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. From generation to generation. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Elam, S.K. (Ed.), A decade of Gallup Polls on attitudes toward education. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan, 1978.
- Firestone, W. A., & Herriott, R. E. The bureaucratic elementary school: Comparing two images of elementary, junior high, and high schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California 1981.
- For Character, Chicago. School information form, 1982-1983. Chicago: For Character, 1983.
- Gallup Youth Survey. A study of attitudes toward the public schools among teenagers. Princeton, N.J.: The Gallup Organization, 1979.

- Gallup, G. The fourteenth annual Gallup Poll of public's attitudes toward the public school," Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 64, 37-50.
- Guba, E.G. Towards a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles, Cal.: University of California, 1979.
- Haberman, M., & Stinnett, T.M. Teacher education and the new profession of teaching. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1973.
- Kirp, M. & Yudof, M. Educational policy and the law. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1974.
- Mann, D. The politics and administration of instructionally effective schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, 1980.
- Meyers, D. A. Teacher power: Professional and collective bargaining. Lexington, Mass.: Heath/Lexington, 1973.
- Meyers, E. D. Education in the perspective of history. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Planning Department. Characteristics of effective urban schools. Detroit: Office of Research, Planning, and Evaluation, Detroit Public Schools, 1981.
- Postman, N. Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte, 1969.
- Rutter, M., et al. Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Salley, C., McPherson, B., & Baehr, M. What principals do: A preliminary occupational analysis. In Erickson, D. & Reller, T. (Eds.), The principal in metropolitan schools. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

- Sarason, S. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982. Second Edition.
- Skinner, B. F. Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
- Sowell, T. Black education: Myths and tragedies. New York: David McKay, 1972.
- Stogdill, R. N. Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Valliant, P. G. Adaptation to life. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- Venezky, R. L., & Winfield, L. Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading. Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware, Department of Educational Survey, 1979.
- Villanova, R. M., et al, The Connecticut school effectiveness interview. Hartford, Conn.: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1981.
- Weber, G. Inner city children can be taught to read. Occasional papers, No. 18. Washington, D.C.; Council for Basic Education, 1971.
- Wellisch, J. B., et al. School management and organization in successful schools.
- Whiting, B. B. & Whiting, J. W. Children in six cultures. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Wise, A. E. Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Wynne, E. A. Looking at schools. Lexington, Mass.: Heath/Lexington, 1980(a).
- Wynne, E. A. Good school checklist. Chicago: Character, 1980(b).
- Wynne, E. A. Growing up suburban. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1977.